

## DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 119 284

EA 007 892

TITLE Internationalizing Management Education. A Report of Four Conferences.

INSTITUTION National Commission for UNESCO (Dept. of State), Washington, D.C.

SPONS AGENCY Georgia State Univ., Atlanta. School of Business Administration.; Home Health Services of Louisiana, Inc., New Orleans.; Indiana Univ., Bloomington. Graduate School of Business.; Tufts Univ., Medford, Mass. Fletcher School of Law and Diplomacy.

PUB DATE 73

NOTE 32p.; Not available in hard copy due to marginal legibility of original document

AVAILABLE FROM U.S. National Commission for UNESCO, Washington, D.C. 20520; also Academy for Educational Development, 680 Fifth Avenue, New York, New York 10019

EDRS PRICE MF-\$0.83 Plus Postage. HC Not Available from EDRS.

DESCRIPTORS \*Business Administration; Business Education; \*Conference Reports; Higher Education; Interinstitutional Cooperation; \*International Education; \*Management Education; \*Symposia

## ABSTRACT

This report summarizes highlights of discussions at a series of conferences intended to stimulate cooperation between American universities and the business community in an effort to improve education in the field of international business. Approximately 250 business and educational leaders participated in four regional conferences, which were held at major universities in the Midwest, Southeast, Northwest, and Northeast during the final three months of 1972. The report does not summarize the content of each conference separately, but rather attempts to present the ideas and concerns common to all four conferences. In addition to a brief introduction, the report consists of four short chapters entitled "Toward Global Economic Advance," "What Business Needs," "Challenges to Education," and "A Pause in the Conversation: Some Initial Suggestions for Action." A complete list of participants in each of the conferences is also included. (JG)

\*\*\*\*\*

\* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished \*  
\* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort \*  
\* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal \*  
\* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality \*  
\* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available \*  
\* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not \*  
\* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions \*  
\* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. \*

\*\*\*\*\*

ED119284

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,  
EDUCATION & WELFARE  
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF  
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

*Internationalizing  
Management  
Education*

1973

UNITED STATES NATIONAL COMMISSION FOR UNESCO  
Washington, D.C. 20520

EA 007 892

# Advisory Committee on Business and International Education of the United States National Commission for UNESCO

\*Ormsbee W. Robinson, *Chairman*  
Director of University Relations Planning  
International Business Machines Corporation

\* H. Igor Ansoff,  
*Dean*  
Graduate School of Management  
Vanderbilt University

# Willis C. Armstrong  
Assistant Secretary of State  
for Economic Affairs  
Department of State

\* Joseph M. Bertotti  
Manager - Educational Relations  
General Electric Company

Donald A. Eldridge  
*President*  
Bennett College

\* John Fayerweather  
Professor of International Business  
Graduate School of Business  
Administration  
New York University

Samuel B. Gould  
*President*  
Institute for Educational  
Development

Dorothy Gregg  
Assistant to Director of Public  
Relations  
U.S. Steel Corporation

Kermit O. Hanson  
*Dean*  
School of Business Administration  
University of Washington

H. Field Haviland  
Professor of International Politics  
Fletcher School of Law and  
Diplomacy  
Tufts University

Walter G. Held  
Director of Administration  
The Brookings Institution

Vivian W. Henderson  
*President*  
Clark College

\* Wilmer H. Kingsford  
President  
Management Institute for National  
Development

\* Albrecht M. Lederer  
Vice Chancellor  
International Academy of  
Management

Schuyler F. Otteson  
*Dean*  
Graduate School of Business  
Indiana University

---

\* Executive Committee

\* Resigned upon appointment as Assistant Secretary of State  
for Economic Affairs; formerly President, U.S. Council,  
International Chamber of Commerce.

\* Appointed to succeed Willis C. Armstrong

## Judd Polk  
Acting President  
U.S. Council  
International Chamber of Commerce

\* G. Clark Thompson  
Senior Vice President, International Affairs  
The Conference Board

Irwin T. Sanders  
Chairman  
Department of Sociology  
Boston University

John S. Walter  
Deputy Executive Director  
Business Council for International  
Understanding

Robert M. Sprinkle  
Executive Director  
International Association for the  
Exchange of Students for Technical  
Experience/U.S., Inc.

Harold B. Young  
Professor of Management  
School of Business Management  
Georgia State University

W. Homer Turner, *Secretary*  
Vice President  
Academy for Educational Development

Company or organizational associations are included  
for identification only; they do not share in the  
responsibility borne by the individuals.

A Report  
of four conferences sponsored by the  
Advisory Committee on Business and International Education  
of the  
U. S. National Commission for UNESCO\*  
in cooperation with  
The Graduate School of Business, Indiana University  
The School of Business Administration, Georgia State University  
The Fletcher School of Law and Diplomacy, Tufts University  
The Graduate School of Business Administration, University of Washington

\*United Nations Educational, Scientific, Cultural Organization

Introduction: Starting a Conversation	page 1
Towards Global Economic Advance	page 4
What Business Needs	page 7
Challenges to Education	page 10
A Pause in the Conversation: Some Initial Suggestions for Action	page 15
Conference Participants	page 19

The growing consciousness that we are all part of a global society is having a profound effect on our approaches to many human problems. We are aware as never before of the need for new knowledge and understanding of the radical forces at work throughout the world -- economic, social and political. We also know that our capacity to manage these changes must be strengthened if we are to avoid catastrophe.

It is in this context that the Advisory Committee on Business and International Education of the United States National Commission for UNESCO has sought over the past year, and especially through the four regional conferences whose findings are summarized in this report, to do four things: (1) to stimulate schools of business to reexamine their programs of study in international business and world affairs and to measure their work against the imperative expressed by Eric Larrabee that in a global society "a graduate without a world perspective on his profession has not been properly trained;" (2) to encourage the business community to review the adequacy of its current concepts and programs of management development and practice, especially in their international dimension, and also its programs of educational contributions and investment to determine if they give adequate recognition to the support of research and teaching in international business and world affairs; (3) to encourage the universities and the business community to explore new ways of collaborating to strengthen the international di-

mension of management education in such a way that the technical vitality of their programs is matched by their humane content; and (4) to explore ways in which the universities and the business community may develop a more effective partnership with appropriate agencies of our own government, such as the Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs of the Department of State and the U. S. National Commission for UNESCO and with international organizations such as UNESCO and OECD.

Pursuing these objectives, the Advisory Committee co-sponsored four conferences in the final months of 1972, each held at a major university notable in these activities.

The four regional conferences -- Midwest, Southeast, Northwest and Northeast -- all were planned and executed in line with general topical guidelines provided by the Advisory Committee. These guidelines were distributed well in advance of the October, November and December meetings so that there was adequate time for the host institutions to fit area major interests constructively into a general pattern reflecting variations in emphasis, area by area, on opportunities and responsibilities with respect to concerns of academia, enterprise, and government for more and better education for management responsibilities in a global society.

The four broad discussion fields were:

1. Encouragement of closer cooperation between universities and the business community with

- respect to the improvement of educational programs for those anticipating careers in business in other countries and/or management of international business operations.
2. Identification and definition of the educational prerequisites for present and future business leaders with respect to the global environment in which they will operate and which their decisions will affect.
  3. Exploration and encouragement of closer institutional relationships with foreign centers, especially through faculty and student exchange programs.

4. Formulation of specific recommendations for joint program activities on the part of the universities and the business community.

In each case the leadership was provided by a member of our Advisory Committee, and each of the conferences carved out a distinctive aspect of the subject for its focus. Here are the subjects, institutions, guiding members from the Advisory Committee and their colleagues and associates who played a leading role in assuring the success of each conference:

"Multinational Agenda for Business Firms and Business Schools"	Graduate School of Business, Indiana University, Bloomington, Indiana	Dean Schuyler E. Otteson	Professor Paul J. Gordon
"Future International Business Education Programs and Perspectives"	School of Business Administration, Georgia State University, Atlanta, Georgia.	Dr. Harding B. Young, Professor of Management.	Dean Kenneth Black, School of Business Administration and Assistant Professor Jose R. de la Torre, Jr.
"International Business Education"	Graduate School of Business Administration, University of Washington, Seattle, Washington	Dean Kermit O. Hanson	Mr. George Weyerhaeuser, President, Weyerhaeuser Company and Professor Richard W. Moxon
"Business and International Education"	The Fletcher School of Law and Diplomacy, Tufts University, Medford, Mass.	Professor H. Field Haviland	Dean Edmund A. Gullion

The programs and reports of each of the four regional conferences are available from the host institutions. What follows represents highlights of the discussions participated in by the approximately 250 leaders in various fields of professional and general concern involved in the four conferences.

These conferences were, we hope, the beginning of a conversation of some import for American business and American education. The subject of the conversation is how to make the education of managers adequate to the challenge of a coming global society.

This report builds upon the earlier findings reported in *Business and Education for World Affairs*.<sup>\*</sup> America has moved dramatically towards a global perspective in the two years since that report. We hope the present document is

equally responsive to the sharpened challenge this poses to business and education.

Many other people have helped to make these conferences and this concluding report possible. The essential costs were met in large measure by a grant from the Department of State, supplemented by contributions from each of the cooperating institutions and several private donors. The encouragement that the project has received from its start from the Assistant Secretary for Educational and Cultural Affairs of the Department of State, John Richardson, Jr., and

<sup>\*</sup> *Business and Education for World Affairs: A Report of the Business Task Force to the International Education Year Committee of the U. S. National Commission for UNESCO, September, 1971. Copies of this report are no longer available.*



his deputy, Alan Reich, has been unstinting; we are grateful to both of them. We also were helped immeasurably by the enthusiastic initial direction given our work by the former chairman of the U. S. National Commission for UNESCO, A. Marvin Braverman, and the continued support of his successor, Dr. R. Miller Upton. Finally, the assistance and guidance of Dr. Alvin C. Eurich has kept us steadily at our task, commencing with his sponsorship of the work of the original Task Force when he served as chairman during 1969 and 1970 of the International Education Year Steering Committee for the National Commission, and since that time in his relation to us through the staff services provided for our Advisory Committee by the Academy for Educational Development of which he is president.

Finally, we have been favored with the skillful and dedicated professional services of our two Executive Secretaries. The Reverend John D. Cannon, now a consultant for planning and development to the Episcopal Diocese of New

York worked with us until January 1972. Since then Dr. W. Homer Turner, who also serves as vice president for the Academy for Educational Development, has been administering our affairs with equal aplomb and effectiveness.

We hope that the findings of these conferences and the various recommendations made by the educators, the businessmen and the government officials who participated in them will lead to increased attention to the problems of world business and to the educational requirements for the development of managers equal to the tasks with which they will be entrusted. We need all of the strength and wisdom we can enlist in this effort, because we believe that we can move ahead only if it becomes a truly co-operative undertaking of many disciplines and many institutions.

Ormsbee W. Robinson  
Chairman

March 1, 1973

After the United Nations General Assembly proclaimed International Education Year, I, as Chairman of the United States National Commission for UNESCO, was privileged to review the constructive work of various task forces and study committees. Since then I have followed with great interest the progress of the Advisory Committee to the Commission on Business and International Education.

Their Report deserves careful study by anyone concerned with the international aspects of education, business and public affairs.

The actions recommended herein by the Advisory Committee are exceedingly important to the academic and business communities and to governmental administrators and policy-makers. They deserve prompt and vigorous implementation.

Alvin C. Eurich, President  
The Academy for Educational Development

## TOWARDS GLOBAL ECONOMIC ADVANCE

There is rising in every part of human affairs a growing sense of global belonging, sometimes full-flown, at other points only faintly and flittingly experienced. Has not each of us come to feel, more and more in recent years, the sense of living in a planetary environment? Businessmen, teachers, students, public officials — anyone who, by virtue of talents and training, pursues his calling “at the height of the times,” is part of one or more communities that transcend local and even national borders. The lives of such people have an international dimension more substantial and complex than is generally acknowledged, and which increasingly commands a larger proportion of personal and institutional attention.

Even the man in the street has become globally conscious. He has sensed the dangers to the world as an ecological unit. He has seen the need to break through hitherto inviolable restrictions, such as the Bamboo Curtain, to reach for greater cooperation. The most potent product of the Space Program, it has been argued, is that single photograph of the whole earth, never before imaged in its simple one-ness, which the astronauts brought back from space and stamped on the human mind forever. There are no borders in that picture.

Many factors have conduced to this global perspective. Medical science and health services continue to increase in availability and effectiveness; the control of epidemics has advanced

to the point where serious danger of major plagues spread through new carriers — the tens of millions of daily world air passengers — is minimal. Millions in many lands continue to be greatly undernourished — but notable gains are being made in the attack on the world protein shortage by creation of low-cost substitutes and other means. Certainly rising literacy and the spread of worldwide education, accompanied by multiple universalized applications of new knowledge gained from science and technology, are major catalysts. Population control efforts are increasingly effective, though we still face potential catastrophic conditions by the year 2,000 from imbalances between resources and sheer numbers of people. The Stockholm Conference, and others with kindred agendas, give promise that the basic resources of the planet will come under greater scrutiny everywhere in the common concerns affecting all life.

These and other signs herald a more open, cooperative, mutually-sustaining intercourse between the multiple sovereignties of the world, and, interculturally, between their millions of citizens.

Global economic advance is both a cause and an effect of this heartening upturn in mankind's prospects. In every department of international affairs — political, economic, social, scientific, military, biological — a series of events and portents give a promise of the emergence of a new and more favorable climate for world-wide

enterprise than has characterized recent past years. These harbingers are by no means confined to the Moscow-Peking Presidential visitations and the latter-day events in Southeast Asia -- significant as such developments appear to be by way of ushering in a new era of detente and international cooperation.

Arms limitation negotiations, renewed discussions of tariff barrier removal, the current 120-nation monetary and currency discussions, the growing adherence of many nations (now about 60) to the international tribunal for disputes between private investors and governments, the Helsinki multi-nation conference on East-West trade development, the Sino-Japanese rapprochement and more satisfying mutual appreciation of U.S.A.-Japanese national concerns -- all these clearly bespeak the arrival of a genuinely different global climate from the prior decade.

U.S. investment abroad is now more than 155 billion dollars, a five-fold increase in 20 years. The products generated by these assets have a value of above 200 billion dollars annually -- equal to one-fifth of the entire G.N.P. of the U.S.A. It is notable that the production of U.S. corporations abroad is more than five times the recent annual level of U.S. exports. Multinational corporations are expanding at the rate of more than 10 per cent yearly, twice the growth rate for gross world product. Should present trends continue, within the remaining years of this century the economy of the world will be more than half internationalized through the further development and expansion of multinational corporations of both foreign and domestic origin.

The U.S. is poised for a great debate on these issues. International trade will dominate the Nixon Administration's agenda for the next year. The White House is set to push strongly for liberalized tariffs designed to augment the President's other foreign policy initiatives, as well as to whittle down the nation's multi-billion trade deficit. A "Nixon Round" of trade talks is to begin in Geneva in September, and the Administration seeks a Congressional mandate to offer concessions in reduced barriers to imports. But at the same time organized labor and other protectionist forces, alarmed at the effects of burgeoning imports on American jobs and profits, are girding for a major fight in Congress to resist further liberalization. While the exact outcome

of the looming struggle is uncertain, there is little doubt that the year will witness a decisive redefinition of the nation's posture in international trade.

In this new climate, much hope hinges on the vast growth in use of risk capital investment, applied through modern corporate enterprise under conditions where management skills can be used freely to produce the goods and services increasingly demanded on a world scale.

The most visible expression of this impulse is the multinational corporation (MNC), sometimes referred to as the transnational or supranational corporation. These institutions are characterized by John McHale, of the State University of New York at Binghamton, as "unprecedented by virtue of their size, global-diffused production, and relative autonomy from constraining national boundaries. They may typically use the capital of several nations, the territory of another group, and the labor force of many more." Translated into hard figures by Professor Walter Goldstein, "a multinational company is one with sales above \$100 million, operations in at least six countries, and overseas subsidiaries accounting for at least 20 per cent of its assets. Some 4,000 companies qualify, accounting for 15 per cent of the gross world product."

The MNCs have provoked not hopes alone, but also fears: from developing countries, from the Common Market and other developed areas, from labor unions, from smaller national enterprises, from national governments, and sometimes from the common man. They can be viewed as irresponsible private powers grown too big for the common good, rather than as essential new instruments of worldwide production, distribution, and economic development.

But no one denies their importance, or the likelihood of their further expansion. Many factors are working on the side of the globalists. International money and capital markets are growing; availability and pace of transportation and communication are improving in many areas; new processes and technologies are emerging; the fear of military confrontation between the great powers is diminishing.

While the growth of multinational corporations may slacken for a time, if political authorities can improve the enabling conditions within the framework of nationalistic concerns, the longer term outlook is for a further vast growth

of international entrepreneurial efforts. Moreover, many smaller, more limited enterprises augment the climate of internationalism in commerce: the joint private-government venture, the governmental trading corporation, the licensing and regulatory inventions now being created afresh - all these are important parts of the total picture.

Bismarck's quip "trade follows the flag," needs revision. The present prospect is that the flags of many nation-states will follow commerce and trade, slowly but inevitably, towards global community.

\* \* \*

The engine of global economic advance is modern management - management of resources, management of facilities, management of capital, management of people.

What distinguishes international management from management *per se*? Perhaps it is this: management initiates, organizes, plans, directs, controls the scope and nature of an enterprise in all of its multiple internal and external relationships, international management includes all this, and, as well, the added complexities of quite different cultures, economics, politics, and levels of responsibility to fellow humans. In short, it is management *per se plus!*

Enterprise has a direct, major stake in the effectiveness of the preparation of talented persons for internationally-related careers; hence business should work in the closest rapport with schools of business administration and management and with other professional schools concerned with public and private international affairs. Unfortunately the mutualities of academia and those of enterprise have been too little explored by educational and business leaders. The time is at hand when this situation must change if full advantage is to be taken of the new climate for general international economic advance. It is one of the purposes of this report to stress the mutual interests and suggest the means by which enhanced relationships may be established and maintained.

Government, as well, has a primary, urgent and continuous responsibility to foster and advance the art and science of management. Political leaders, wherever seated, are judged by their ability and success in handling the economic life of their country. They are required to maintain a continuous upward improvement in the scale or standard of living, to see to it that both unemployment and underemployment are diminished and kept at low levels, to retain an essential level for the value of money, balancing out prices and taxes and profits, the while keeping the quality and scope of social services at satisfactory standards. Whatever their attitudes toward the MNCs and other international enterprises, governments throughout the world have a critical concern with the effectiveness with which management functions are performed.

Nowhere is this more true than in those poorer reaches of the South of the world. The use of techniques and capital in the nations of the South, in the wisest manner of which managerial man is capable, will largely determine their prospects for prosperity, peace, and progress.

The historic lurch into a global society has caught American management, like the rest of us, ill-prepared to deal with sharp new challenges to its capabilities, understanding, and imagination. Managers must rapidly and accurately reorient themselves to a new environment, with new dangers and new opportunities. The planetary economic future is a mix of great hopes and ominous prospects. No greater challenge has ever presented itself to man's nascent capability for shaping institutions to meet his emerging needs. A new Adam, he is confronted with the whole earth and all its resources, out of which to make for all men a better life. Or to make - again for all men, since our interdependence is now inescapable - a wasteland of want and despair.

This is work of the first priority for each of us. Business: and the men and women of business, have a leading role to play - a role that cannot be evaded. But they need help in growing into that new role.

## WHAT BUSINESS NEEDS

Coiled at the core of business' concern is the gnawing awareness of a gap, a lack, a potentially fatal flaw that must be remedied. Great mistakes could be made, and no nation, firm, organization, or individual wants to be party to that. Carl Gilbert, former board chairman of Gillette, referred forthrightly, at the Fletcher Conference, to "the possibility of ill-considered decisions, the aftermath of which can be lasting and serious."

We are rapidly leaving behind the era when business decisions could be made within and among nations on the basis of ideological formulae, and in which commercial dominance was bestowed by mere control of raw materials and productive capacity. Today, both ideology and possession are increasingly overshadowed by organizing ability, technical knowledge, and the resulting ability to serve markets and consumers. The key to the future of business success in the international sphere is managerial capacity — for the individual and the firm. And the new international context demands a re-definition of managerial capacity.

American business' interests in this problem vary, depending on exactly whose concerns one considers. Taken as a whole, the American business system has a set of comprehensive goals, of course. But separate business enterprises also have their more sharply skewed preoccupations. Moreover, individual managers, as well as stockholders, have their particular perspectives. One of the primary purposes of the conferences was to give as full voice as possible to these varied expressions of what business needs and wants.

And varied they were: in fact, some basic conflicts revealed themselves. Some businessmen stressed their urgent need for specific skills, "nuts-and-bolts" capabilities for middle-level executives. But the other business leaders, and academics, usually emphasized the need for a broad, theoretical education for top-level management. "There is disagreement between the business and academic communities as to the goals of international business education," the Atlanta conferees frankly reported. "As a result, it is difficult for teachers and businessmen to aid one another in the advancement of business conducted on an international basis."

But significant progress seems to have been made in clarifying the new needs of business. Let us begin by looking at these new needs. They are as important to educators as to businessmen, of course, since only insofar as businessmen see them being satisfied will they provide the needed support and collaboration which is so essential.

\* \* \*

What, then, does the manager, the management team, the firm, the collective enterprise of a nation like the U.S. — what do these individuals and entities need to know and to do in the new global business environment?

Broadly, the areas which businessmen must master are dictated by the challenges they face in the new internationalized business arena. These challenges, broadly sketched by Professor Milton Katz of the Harvard Law School, are:

Investment abroad on such a scale by American business requires personnel who understand the general economy, the structure of business and finance, the legal system and the behavior patterns of the nations in which the investments are made. International trade on such a scale requires personnel with a comparable understanding of the structure and behavior patterns of international trade, international payments, international banking, and the international economy in broad terms. Direct investment by American business in foreign countries on the scale indicated involves the employment of large numbers of nationals of the countries in which the business firms operate. This in turn requires American personnel who understand the labor and employment standards and habits of the 'host' nations. It also requires foreign personnel (i.e. nationals of the host countries) who understand the standards, operational methods and folkways of American business.

Beyond avoiding costly and damaging mistakes, and even beyond meeting immediate problems, business' new-felt needs spring even more from larger, positive impulses. American managers are clearly reaching for new kinds of success, more complex ideals of managerial achievement. A provocative list of new capacities for managers emerged from the Indiana University conference. The fact that it reads more like a profile of the ideal "overseas operative" rather than like a portrait of the internationalized top manager of the future, reflects an important point of conflict in this developing conversation. While university teachers and scholars look to the long future and see the need for broadly-educated leaders of management, business feels sharp and urgent needs for specific skills:

- ★ He should know the language well, for both oral and written communication.
- ★ He should understand the basic geopolitics, economics, social structure, and culture.
- ★ He should relate well to new kinds of people.
- ★ He should be able to negotiate, bargain, and help resolve conflicts in a cross-cultural setting.

- ★ He should have the executive skills to manage financially autonomous units dealing with foreign markets, governments, financiers, stockholders, unions, and other groups.
- ★ He should have unusual talents and skills for tolerating ambiguous situations, adapting to new conditions.
- ★ He should be able to develop talents and potential in his subordinates and key technical staff.
- ★ He should have the strength of personality to be able to act forcefully but sensitively in an unfamiliar context.

Even beyond these handsome capabilities, however, American management seems to be seeking something more. It was defined best by John Allison, Senior Vice President of Raytheon, when he urged a shift from the view that foreign business affairs are a speciality within management, to one which recognizes that:

There must be a substantial amount of understanding and appreciation of the foreign scene spread throughout domestic management centers. I'd venture to say that amongst the graduates of colleges and universities of this country who end up in business as a career, upwards of 70 percent of them will at some stage, and in many cases at a surprisingly early stage in their careers, be exposed in a meaningful way, as part of the routine of their jobs, to the so-called special problems of foreign business.

So it not sufficient for international capability to exist only in top-most management cadres. It is needed by and for a much wider spectrum of U.S. business personnel who affect international business whether they work abroad or at home, as well as other Americans in fields like education, labor, and government.

\* \* \*

Moreover, American management increasingly realizes that their business in foreign countries is usually best conducted by employees who are foreign nationals, rather than by Americans trained for international responsibilities. "The success of my company in international operations in the next 10 years," said Robert S. MacNeill of Eli Lilly International, "does not



depend upon the availability of superior products -- these we have. It depends upon our ability to find and absorb into our international operations effective foreign nationals." So education for international management must encompass far more than preparing Americans to serve overseas.

And new awareness, understanding, and capacity must go far beyond expertness in specific foreign areas, or practical know-how about certain ways of operating across national boundaries. The men and women who exercise business and social leadership through multinational management increasingly will need to have what Professor Perlmutter calls a "geocentric" approach to their mission. Transcending both home-grown nationalism and adaptation to exotic environs, these managers will be pioneers in conceiving, conducting, and advancing enterprise on a truly worldwide basis. Business leadership in a worldwide society must be worldwide in its vision and in its capabilities.

Business needs new knowledge and understanding to forge this management capability. Through research and experimentation, both the universities and the corporations must strive to comprehend the nature of the changing world, to isolate and define the issues generated by change, and, finally, to devise an appropriate education for the modern manager. One of the major fruits of this research will be to show decision-makers -- private and governmental -- how to apply their recruitment policies, their marketing practices, their organizational development programs, and their other efforts so that they do in fact utilize to the full the talents and motivations of men and women who are actually well-prepared for international undertakings.

The conferences noted that business has almost wholly neglected to underwrite significant international managerial research. Nor has it truly attempted in-depth dialog which would help define the kinds of insights, skills, and topical or functional maturation it seeks as employer of graduates. The exceptions to these caustic observations are fairly numerous and, where exceptions exist, are most significant examples of the wisdom and capability of joint enterprise and academic cooperation. But, in essence, the exceptions are too few, against the international time clock.

\* \* \*

What Business needs, then, to cope with the new global context of American enterprise, is:

- \* men and women better-prepared to cope with international operations,
- \* opportunities for promising managers to augment their intercultural understanding and skills,
- \* ways that top management may share in the findings of relevant academic work,
- \* training opportunities that provide both practical skills and the deeper understandings and values that will enable managers to function both efficiently and sensitively,
- \* access to new knowledge and findings bearing on international operations,
- \* widespread public understanding and appreciation of the significance of international business operations as a productive factor in the emerging world order,
- \* ways to identify, attract, and possibly provide managerial training for foreign nationals.

These are needs for which business can and must look to outside agencies for help, primarily to the universities. But business has a prior need -- a need to review the adequacy of its own policies and programs of employment, advancement, management development and practice, as well as its programs of educational contributions and investment. The rewards available in business provide the most powerful incentive for changing education and research for business. To encourage students, teachers, and scholars to deepen their commitment to internationalized studies, business must reconsider its criteria for hiring and advancing managers towards international responsibilities, and its willingness to collaborate both substantively and financially in the universities' programs of teaching, research, and international cooperation. By its decisions, business will nourish, or neglect, the needed flowering of management education for a global society.

## CHALLENGES TO EDUCATION

The education of internationally-capable managers is only a strapping in American higher learning. Born a mere decade and a half ago, the field naturally lacks that clarity of form and solidity of substance found in the older academic disciplines out of which it coalesced: marketing, finance, economics, management. But it is already clear that this youngster is a new creature, not a mere chip off the old block. Sired by the new needs of business which have just been surveyed, this newcomer feeds on the burgeoning data and concepts created by a world in economic flux. But there is much work to be done, and growth is slow.

Given the notorious conservatism and resistance to change typical of the academy, it is little wonder that theory and teaching have lagged behind the marked acceleration of internationalized enterprise. Despite the far-sightedness of some leaders in the universities, movement has been sluggish towards meeting the needs for an internationalized curriculum, for bolder research thrusts, and for greater collaboration with business.

The campus mood has not bolstered such efforts. Students' and faculty attention and concern have focused, over the past five years, on domestic issues and problems. Activist students and young professors, as well as funding agencies both public and private, have become pre-occupied with the crisis of our cities, racial unrest and civil liberties, inflation and unemployment, the pervasive malaise about values and priorities throughout the society. What energies

were focused outward were largely fixated on the Vietnam conflict. "This shift in emphasis on the part of students and younger faculty and in priorities for financial support is understandable," said Milton Katz, continuing:

"In a sense, one could even argue that it was right and made sense, in the short run. But the international and foreign aspects of American business interests remain facts of life. So do the problems and prospects of adjustment and conflict between the advanced industrial societies and the LDCs; between the United States and the Soviet Union, the United States and China, the Soviet Union and China; between the United States and Western Europe, and between Western Europe and Eastern Europe; between Japan and China; among America, Europe, the Soviet Union, and the Middle East. These problems will not go away. They will not cease to be important, even vital. The need for understanding and for qualified personnel will remain and increase."

Of course, a few exceptional programs have developed, such as those at the institutions which hosted these four conferences, and at New York University, Stanford, the University of Chicago, Harvard, MIT, Columbia, American University, Thunderbird Graduate School, the University of Washington, among others. Some major corporations, among them General Electric and International Business Machines, internationalized their



training programs for upper management and a few schools and agencies outside the corporate or academic structure have developed excellent programs both in this country and western Europe.\*

But these fine initiatives are less than adequate to the need. For the most part, education for business has not responded sufficiently as yet to the changing patterns of world business and the new needs for internationalized education of managers. Few schools, departments or programs have liberated themselves sufficiently from the besetting occupational vices of academe: curricula built from the bottom up rather than from the top down with a holistic approach; lip-service rather than action on interdisciplinary work; traditional teaching techniques and approaches; outdated or irrelevant materials; programs shaped by the criteria of funding agencies and donors, rather than by well-thought out priorities; lack of connection with the fast-changing off-campus world; above all, in this particular field, what one observer calls "tribalism" — the unexamined assumption that the traditional American concepts of business management can be applied without radical revision in quite different environments throughout the world.

What is needed is to make explicit and widespread certain new directions already pioneered effectively in a small number of schools. We have a long way to go beyond the few programs now in existence. This is a challenge for scholarship and pedagogy terms of both quality and quantity, beginning with accelerated research and leading to the implementation of new programs of teaching and experimental learning.

What specifically are the components of that challenge? The problems here are manifold, the conferences disclosed. Few business faculty members currently possess an international competency or perspective. For example, here are some of the principle capacities which a business faculty should collectively have, as formulated at the Indiana conference:

\* New developments in the field are reported regularly in an excellent newsletter published by the American Assembly of Collegiate Schools of Business. For readers interested in advanced educational programs for executives, see *Universities' International Executive Development Programs*, John M. Dyer and Rene Larrieu Jr., available from the Marketing Department of Gulf Oil Company.

1. A professional school orientation with special reference to two major attributes of what we choose to construe as professional:

- a) Concern with knowledge building, that is linkage with and even adding to the extension of knowledge in established and related disciplines; as well as concern with developing and extending the application of knowledge in the world of practical affairs; with great emphasis on capacity to bridge the two; and,
- b) Concern with legitimacy, responsiveness and accountability as well as achieving objectives of effectiveness, efficiency, support and improvement.

2. The capacity to cluster multidisciplinary as well as applied interests not solely around problems designated in the so-called disciplines but more importantly around problems and priorities recognized as significant in national and multinational affairs.

3. The strength in depth also in the theory building, research design and research applications of one or more disciplines.

4. The strength in depth in applied areas of politics, economics, social science, management and specialties such as finance, law and taxes as they require unusual expertise in multinational dealings.

5. A network of national and international contacts, institutional and person-to-person, to facilitate ongoing exchange, research, learning, fellowships, internships, sponsorship of students and faculty and business associates and the like in public, private, university, government, business and other sectors across national boundaries.

6. An arrangement of faculty assignments, assistance, financing, evaluation, measurement, rewards, promotion and tenure to provide recognition (even if not instant prestige) and time to venture into research, learning and public service not defined as the immediate and high payoff areas for younger, untenured or even senior faculty under current private and public formal and informal rules. As they operate.

7. The option to move from one institution to another with room for alternate choices — the design of major research, teaching and public service strategies; major variables and commitments that each institution can readily take on

and perform with distinction and add to an aggregate effort of joint cooperation; this representing perhaps what some of our consortium efforts should most strive for and sometimes achieve.

8. The resources for the development of its organizational capacities to build institutions in some sectors of society and rebuild them in others with understanding of some of the underlying disciplines involved and the practical problems in application.

9. The cross cultural skills required in working back and forth between the university and the business setting and at home and abroad with sufficient understanding of what is involved to assist in the total reorientation of faculties and the better preparation of managers for the future.

10. A concern with the development of transfer skills and diffusion as they apply to technology and information and other important considerations back and forth across sectors and across national boundaries.

11. A concern for the design of ongoing learning, including research as one kind of learning with sufficient differentiation in deciding what kinds of output may be required for effectiveness in managerial use in different settings so that in fact what has commonly been used as input and starting point for learning including research may be changed at times, even revolutionized, presenting new challenge and ferment for the academic establishment.

12. In the professional school context, not exclusive but at least considerably greater commitment than is common to the "middle range" of theory building and knowledge application. This kind of knowledge-building on the one hand and practical testing and application on the other, and the learning of what is involved in transformation and change, may enrich both business and universities at home and abroad. This is the ideal aggregate position for the professional school and the most likely to make the universities a useful resource to business and business a useful resource to the universities.

13. A possible division of labor among faculties or among schools and universities to increase effect and reduce redundancy by having consortium arrangements not only as to financing but

as to the lead strategy and territory for excellence best to be taken on by each faculty and institution. For example, one might be more the center of excellence for looking at environmental variables as they relate to the problems under consideration, another technological variables, another information variables, another behavioral variables, and so forth. The precise illustration is thoroughly contrived and might break down in practice. Yet we already have examples with some of the work by Ray Vernon and by John Fayerweather and others who have taken strategic and productive initiatives at one school or another.

\* \* \*

Clearly, greater interpenetration of the university and the world of international enterprise is mandated. "The educational community has a need to be brought into contact with the mundane world of business," said Carl Gilbert, "to be stimulated to relevant activity, to put warm flesh and blood on otherwise purely academic problems, and to balance off the inevitable preoccupation with government and government-to-government issues."

Equally important is increasing the interpenetration of diverse cultures, through exchange programs. The Atlanta conference noted that the initial missionary approach to exchange of faculty and students seems to have been overcome. Americans have become sophisticated enough to realize that the aim of such programs is not to "export" our culture or even, necessarily, our methods, without due regard for the wants and needs of the host countries. Neither is our goal in bringing people here, to indoctrinate them in our "better" way. At this point, mutual self-interest is recognized as the most legitimate basis for exchange programs, with foreign and U.S. institutions cooperating on an equal basis. "The possibility for truly significant exchange is now at hand," the Atlanta conferees concluded. They went on to formulate some incisive insights into exchange programs in general:

Goals may be considered in four categories — those of institutions, faculty, students, and management personnel. Institutional goals are to meet demands placed upon them by communities or by their foreign counterparts or to satisfy the need internally for meaningful international ex-

periences. Faculty goals are to secure research experience and to develop maturation from cross-fertilization of ideas and concepts arising from cultural and other differences, particularly from varying social structures. Student goals are heavily for enrichment and for the purpose of adding to sensitivity to and understanding of other nations and cultures. The goal of managers is to secure particular experience needed in some short or long term pragmatic situation.

Program difficulties arise chiefly from the viewpoint of "benefits" and "funding." The benefit aspect turns on who actually gains from whom and between visiting scholars and students. Many questions remain unresolved or have yet to provide fully satisfying answers. What time span for an overseas experience is best? Can the experience be retained, dispersed to others and in what manner — writing reports upon return, monographs, through seminars, etc.?

Another key problem relates to sanctions in the present reward systems of institutions and practices affecting unwanted or unneeded faculty members. Valuations here involved relate to the assumption about the superiority of the individual, the type of experience, etc., or to the inferiority rating of such elements and factors. Fitting experience into course structure and the matter of credits is another hardy perennial in the problem areas.

Funding does not needfully require heavy levels of budgeting. But grants are essential to initiate a program and to tide over its administration until approaching a self-financing stage. Certain state regulations affecting salary levels of faculty do sometimes inhibit program success. Some new types of international consortia could help with many of these problems. Among these additional problems areas are such policy determinations as use of in-house faculty or outside faculty for involvement in exchange.

Clearly the time is at hand for universities, governmental agencies, and business itself, to

reassess their goals and policies regarding the support, selection, and training of foreign nationals in this country.

\* \* \*

Research has received far less attention than has the question of what is the best composite curriculum approach. Yet it is unarguable that course offerings and research inevitably go hand in hand to buttress each other.

The march toward a global economy inevitably raises multiple issues not heretofore investigated. Problems of ceding sovereignty, an expansion of the historic boundaries of international law; monetary pact problem areas; security ownership and trading of multinational corporations; supranational banking facilities; taxation accommodations of common market members; investment of foreign capital regulation — these are representative of the needs for full-scale, sophisticated research.

A whole new repertory of case studies must be undertaken, replacing in part the emphasis earlier given to so-called area studies. Among these would be studies of the history of relations between multinational firms and host countries, study of organization structure as affected by differing area environments, or, by major product groups or by type of indigenous manufacturing or fabrication. Also the evolution of new types of marketing entities under joint ventures, licensing agreements, agency arrangements and the like would be helpful areas for research.

Many of the more successful international ventures have been through small or medium sized entities — as contrasted with the billion dollar international corporation. The literature on these experiences is greatly limited and needs to be expanded through serious research efforts. Indeed such entities may become a principal means for allaying excessive nationalistic fears of foreign capital dominance.

The landmark study on research of potential usefulness, by Lee C. Nehrt, Frederick Truitt, and Richard W. Wright,\* with its catalog of specific topical needs, is a source for extending

\* *"International Business Research — Past, Present, and Future,"* by Lee C. Nehrt, J. Frederick Truitt, and Richard W. Wright, published by the Bureau of Business Research, Graduate School of Business, Indiana University.

to full-scale the above-shown limited illustrations of research potential. The section of that report containing specific research recommendations contains suggestions for both academia and corporations. Research projects are especially important for the corporations themselves for a variety of reasons. Their usefulness in policy decision-making is obvious, as is their practicality in avoiding waste of resources -- capital, manpower, facilities. Not so clearly evident, however, is the additional major gain of full-time academic scholars being associated with enterprise-centered research undertaking to secure the essential objectivity, continuity and scope desired. Much increased cooperative effort here could be enormously beneficial to all.

\* \* \*

"Schools of business should capture the opportunity of playing a leadership role in the business community," insists Dean Schuyler F. Otteson of Indiana University. That is the real challenge to business education -- not merely to catch up with the precipitous internationalization of enterprise, but to set a tone for its scientific, scholarly, and ethical scrutiny. By forging new techniques for teaching, by providing new opportunities for career-long learning for practitioners at every level, and by illuminating this new field through relevant research, schools of business can, as Dean Otteson urges, "be not just reactors, but innovators and inventors."

Thomson

## A Guide to the Conversation: Some Initial Suggestions for Action

The principal accomplishment of the four conferences was the lively exchange of views among educators, businessmen, and governmental officials. The brevity of the sessions and the complexity of the issues precluded the shaping of a sharp consensus on what should be done to improve international education for business. Consciousness-raising rather than decision-making, however, was the intention of these gatherings. Dean Kermit Hanson of the University of Washington well-described the effects of the conference at the University of Washington, on deans, professors of international business, and businessmen. His comments apply to all four conferences:

**For business schools deans.** Helped stimulate consideration of how the international dimension of business should be integrated with the rest of the curriculum, what the objectives of this international education should be, who should be receiving what kinds of international education. For example, to what degree should schools be training specialists in international business, versus giving all students some international exposure? What is the relative importance of language, cultural training, the international dimensions of functional fields, etc? The conference was very useful to schools with developing interests in international affairs in providing a frame of reference to guide them in their efforts to formulate roles for their respective institutions.

**For professors of international business.** Provided a better indication of what kinds of training businessmen expected students to have. Also suggested ways in which businessmen would be willing to cooperate with teaching programs. For example, many leads were developed for beginning case writing projects, visits to classes by businessmen, and so forth. Several concrete joint programs for cooperation among schools were also proposed — for example, an American-Canadian seminar on topics of mutual interest.

**For businessmen.** The wide range of opinions expressed by several businessmen (as well as educators and government representatives) forced businessmen to re-examine their own opinions as to what kind of training was most appropriate for international business, and what kind of people they should be hiring. It also provided them with a better idea of what business schools might be able to offer in terms of training, and also in terms of help with their problems. We have received letters from several businessmen who participated in the conference, indicating that they found the conference to be very stimulating; several have expressed an interest in following up on this meeting by scheduling further meetings, by one-to-one contacts with professors, deans, and students, and by other means.

Such understandings are no small accomplishment in this field, where so many problems arise from the gap between the campus and the real-world arena of international business. "I suspect," said one participant, "that neither side knows enough of the other's problems or capabilities." So it was natural that the conferences largely concurred on the need to maintain, augment, and enhance such communication. The Fletcher School Conference, for example, came to the conclusion that:

There is need for improved communication and collaboration between the business and educational communities regarding all aspects of their common concerns. Many channels can be used for this purpose, including professional associations, top executive councils, consultant arrangements, and special seminars and conferences. Such consultation should be useful regarding the ends and means of not only education but also business. To facilitate such exchanges there should be special personnel and activities within both communities organized especially to promote cooperation between the two areas.

\* \* \*

Better communication, however, is predicated on each of the two parties understanding their own needs and potentialities. Today, neither one does at least not adequately for the most fruitful future collaboration. The conferees generally agreed that both business organizations and business schools need to look closely at the challenges facing them, and to devise explicit, agreed-upon plans for the short and long-range future. This was a second major conclusion of the conferences: that every business school and every corporation with an appropriate concern about these matters, should assign responsibility to a person or group to study the new needs and possibilities, and develop a plan for the future.

Some major changes in emphasis and direction are emerging already, however. A third recommendation of the four conferences was that business schools need to move more vigorously to orient their activities to the new global perspectives in terms of courses, faculty, research, and other projects. Among the specific suggestions which received the most assent were

some of the recommendations of "Business and Education for World Affairs":

Education for management at all levels -- undergraduate, graduate, and post-experience -- needs to be reexamined to determine to what extent and in what ways international and global considerations should be introduced . . . . . Specifically, the Task Force recommends:

- ★ Developing five-year plans for the future in terms of goals, needed resources, and recommended budgets.
- ★ Experimenting with new curricula and teaching approaches.
- ★ Organizing centers and special consortia for research and experimentation.
- ★ Expanding exchanges of persons between the U.S. and other countries.
- ★ Coordinating programs with the changing requirements of corporate international management.
- ★ Stimulating new research relevant to the problems of international management and enterprise.
- ★ Exchanging data more effectively between scholars, and between the academic and business communities.

The four conferences both put these recommendations in a broadened context, and also yielded some specific means by which they might be accomplished. As to the broadened context, it was emphasized that the job of adequately meeting the educational needs of present and future American businessmen is one to which a variety of institutions can and should contribute. Such preparation should be a component of elementary and secondary education, and must certainly be an integral part of undergraduate liberal education. Moreover, some of the most effective education is needed after graduation, at intervals during the businessman's career when his personal advancement, or changes in his firm's operations, generate fresh motivation for pursuing such studies. And here non-academic institutions, including training programs within industry itself, are a vital factor.



In addition to broadening the sources and lengthening the trajectory of international education, the conferences also sought to deepen it. While businessmen disagree among themselves regarding how many openings there will be for executives especially trained in international business, they seem agreed that all students need a basic understanding of the new global climate of enterprise. The conferees called attention to the need for a **humanistic undergirding for such specialized studies**. Business needs men and women of liberal learning and humane disposition. These qualities require an education that "cultivates an awareness of the organic interrelationships among the historic phases and varied aspects of a society, a regard for excellence, the use of judgement and imagination, and high standards of personal performance based upon an appreciation of the human potential." The words are those of one keynote speaker, but the spirit informed all four conferences: technical rigor must be matched by, harnessed to a modicum of wisdom.

\* \* \*

As to the specific means of meeting the challenge, the most pervasive theme of the four conferences was the need to "internationalize the curriculum." Several lines of action were explored.

An inter-disciplinary approach seemed to be preferred, drawing from sociology, political science, cultural studies, history, social psychology, and law. Such an approach to the curriculum would perforce produce whole new fields of study. For example, one business leader noted that there exists no widely-taught discipline of "comparative *management*," comparable to subjects like comparative religion, comparative law, etc. Again, it was proposed that, as former Dean Courtney Brown of Columbia has noted, a "theory of international production" needs to be developed, to complement the traditional "theory of international trade", as a tool in teaching, research business practice, and governmental planning. Such studies, it was suggested, should be considered an integral aspect of training for business at the leadership level, and should perhaps be built into the basic coursework rather than considered a late specialization.

Teaching methods as well as subject matter require reform, the conferees felt. In addition to

the constant pressure to up-date and enrich standard materials -- textbooks, monographs, research works -- entirely new techniques and materials seem to be needed. Better materials and teaching techniques must be developed to make the study of international enterprise up-to-date and potent. Business schools should reappraise what is taught, when it is taught, and how it is taught, from the international perspective. Many conferees desired more direct, action-oriented approaches to teaching and learning in this field. Job exchange programs, faculty internships, businessmen as teachers, simulation exercises, and special training in inter-cultural relations were oft-cited approaches worthy of encouragement and refinement.

**Beyond this, collaborative institutional arrangements are called for.** Again there was implicit endorsement of the recommendations of the earlier report,\* which had urged:

1. Broadening of managerial outlooks through using the resources that universities can bring to bear on-campus, off-campus and through international networks and the kind of passports that university people hold as visitors to universities abroad whether in the arts and sciences, in business, or in combinations.
2. Reorientation of faculty outlooks through interdisciplinary experience in co-operation, research and learning around priorities, agenda and payoff relating to multinational and practical affairs where the challenges of traditional knowledge building find at least an equal match in those of bridging and extending understanding and capacity related to what is involved in putting knowledge to use.
3. Opening many and diverse joint networks, person-to-person associations, information channels, laboratories, talent, consortia possibilities, fellowship, internship, visiting and joint appointment, financing possibilities on a multinational basis and more effective third party support, through demonstration methods of payoff.
4. Joining with supporting agencies of supra-national and national government

\*See above, p. 2.

and foundations in effectively working out significant goals of common concern in the international field.

The Indiana Conference spelled out some of these and other major areas of possible cooperation, in advocating that universities should:

- ★ focus educational resources and programs more deliberately on the changing requirements of corporate international management;
- ★ identify problems for study and research, and stimulate new research that is specifically relevant to the problems of global management and international business operation;
- ★ further the exchange of appropriate data in order to assist the effort of scholars who are engaged in such research;
- ★ provide more consultative opportunities for faculty members, especially in those areas where international or intercultural factors are especially significant in the determination of corporate policy and strategy or in operations.

All of the conferences emphasized that new resources are needed, new input in the form of personnel and access to different experiences. They all pointed to the need for greatly augmented interchanges of persons between business and the academy, and between this country and others. Students should get broader experience through job exchange and internship-exchange programs. Faculty members should have the opportunity to spend a year in a firm engaged in international business, providing consultation and gaining new perspectives. Businessmen should be brought onto the campus for teaching

and consultation. Academic experts and topmost corporate leaders should be convened more often in special short programs in campus settings.

**Enhanced collaboration between schools of business, and business itself, will be crucial in accomplishing many of the recommendations which came out of these conferences.** (There is, of course, a third partner in this picture: government. Although government's contribution *per se* was not the focus of attention at these conferences, it was implicit throughout the proceedings that the climate created and sustained by government policies and regulations do critically affect the content and development of education for international management.) Joint research projects, cooperative exchange programs, shared clearinghouse and data bank operations in such fields as tax systems, clearly call for united efforts between business and education. In other cases, such as the development of more relevant curricula or the upgrading of faculty competencies, the business schools will require funding or other kinds of support.

Such financial support is the necessary if not sufficient enabler of many of these proposed changes. **The conferees especially called upon business to recognize its responsibility for supporting worthwhile programs, institutions, and people. Not only can business help directly, but business leaders can stimulate greater giving from government, foundations and others, with which they have influence.**

At the same time, leaders of business schools must recognize the necessity of showing how present and proposed programs — whether teaching, exchange, research, or cooperative endeavors — will indeed better serve the basic interests of business, and thus earn its support and cooperation.



H. M. Appleton, President  
National Electric Coil Division  
McGraw-Edison

Robert Z. Aliber  
Graduate School of Business  
University of Chicago

Russell Baker, Senior Partner  
Baker & McKenzie

Warren J. Bilkey  
Graduate School of Business  
University of Wisconsin

Harvey C. Bunke, Associate Dean  
Graduate School of Business  
Indiana University

Robert F. Byrnes, Distinguished Professor  
Department of History  
Indiana University

Byrum E. Carter, Chancellor  
Bloomington Campus  
Indiana University

Clifford D. Clark, Dean  
School of Business  
University of Kansas

Raymond S. Cline, Assistant Secretary of State  
Bureau of Intelligence and Research  
U. S. Department of State

John S. Day, Dean  
Krannert Graduate School of Industrial  
Administrators, Purdue University

Alfred P. Diotte, Vice President  
Parker Pen Company

Edward L. Elliott, Associate Professor  
College of Commerce & Business Administration  
University of Illinois

E. Lee Fairley, Acting Deputy Director  
Office of Private Cooperation, Bureau of  
Educational and Cultural Affairs  
U. S. Department of State

Richard N. Farmer, Chairman  
International Business Administration  
Indiana University

Yusaki Furuhashi, Chairman  
Department of Marketing  
University of Notre Dame

Robert H. Garrett, Manager of Administrative  
Services, Graduate School of Business  
Indiana University

Robert E. Georges, Assistant Dean  
College of Administrative Science  
Ohio State University

Paul J. Gordon  
Graduate School of Business  
Indiana University

John T. Hackett, Executive Vice President  
Cummins Engine Company

W. Dickerson Hogue  
Graduate School of Business  
Indiana University

Walter H. C. Laves, Wendell L. Willkie  
Professor Emeritus, Political Science Dept.  
Indiana University

Kullervo Louhi, Dean  
Graduate School of Business Administration  
Michigan State University

Vasilios Basil Kafiris, Director  
Divisions of Economic Research and  
Trade, State of Indiana Department of  
Trade

Robert S. MacNeill, President  
Eli Lilly International

James R. McCoy, Dean  
College of Administrative Science  
Ohio State University

Thomas J. McNichols  
Graduate School of Management  
Northwestern University

Robert Morris, Manager  
Consumer Products International Marketing  
RCA Corporation

Thomas E. Murphy, Dean  
College of Business Administration  
University of Notre Dame

Lee C. Nehrt  
International Business Administration  
Indiana University

Schuyler F. Otteson, Dean  
Graduate School of Business  
Indiana University

William G. Phillips, Chairman & President  
International Multi-Foods Corporation

Ormsbee W. Robinson, Director  
University Planning Relations  
International Business Machines

Richard A. Rosenthal, Chairman of the Board  
St. Joseph Bank & Trust Company

John W. Ryan, President  
Indiana University

Amud Shallaby  
Department of Marketing  
School of Business

William Siffin, Director  
International Development Research Center  
Indiana University

Jerry Skeehan, Personnel Manager  
Caterpillar Tractor

George J. Stolnitz  
Department of Economics  
Indiana University

Donald A. Taylor, Chairman  
Department of Marketing  
Michigan State University

Vern Terpstra, President  
Association for Education in International  
Business, University of Michigan

Mike Thompson, Bureau of Executive  
Education, Graduate School of Business  
Indiana University

John Tse, Krahnert Graduate School of  
Industrial Administration  
Purdue University

W. Homer Turner, Vice President  
Academy for Educational Development

Roger B. Upson, Associate Professor  
School of Business Administration  
University of Minnesota

Joseph M. Waldman, Assistant Dean  
Graduate School of Business  
Indiana University

L. Leslie Waters, University Professor  
Graduate School of Business  
Indiana University

Arthur M. Weimer  
Special Assistant to the President  
Indiana University

Herman B. Wells, Chancellor  
Indiana University

Ralph Westfall, Associate Dean  
Graduate School of Management  
Northwestern University

C. Arthur Williams, Jr., Dean  
School of Business Administration  
University of Minnesota

George M. Wilson, Associate Dean for  
International Programs  
Indiana University

V. K. Zimmerman, Dean  
College of Commerce & Business Administration  
University of Illinois

Alfred L. Seelye  
Board of Directors  
Wolverine World Wide, Inc.

# NORTHEAST REGIONAL CONFERENCE

Charles Francis Adams  
Chairman of the Board  
Raytheon

John Allison  
Raytheon

Thomas Allsopp  
Prudential Insurance Company of America

William S. Barnes  
Fletcher School of Law and Diplomacy

Joseph Bartlett  
Ely, Bartlett, Brown and Proctor

Edward L. Bernays

Joseph Bertotti  
General Electric Company

Gerald Blakely, Jr.  
Cabot, Cabot and Forbes Land Trust

Frederick deW. Bolman  
Exxon Education Foundation

Barbara B. Burn  
Office of International Programs  
University of Massachusetts

Allan W. Cameron  
The Fletcher School of Law and Diplomacy

Erwin D. Canham  
Editor-in-Chief  
The Christian Science Monitor

Antonio de Jesus Cardozo

Frances Clark

Clare M. Cotton  
Boston University

Chester Crocker  
Georgetown University

Carl Gilbert

Walter F. Greeley  
Cabot Corporation

Lawrence T. Griggs  
Fletcher School of Law and Diplomacy

Edmund A. Gullion  
Fletcher School of Law and Diplomacy

Burton C. Hallowell, President  
Tufts University

H. Field Haviland  
Fletcher School of Law and Diplomacy

Rose Hayden  
Midwest Universities' Consortium for  
International Activities

Leo Hochstetter  
Motion Picture Association of America, Inc.

Harry Hull  
International Center of New England

Michael Johnson  
Bureau of Cultural and Educational Affairs  
U. S. Department of State

Milton Katz  
Harvard Law School

Charles P. Kindleberger  
Massachusetts Institute of Technology

Wilmer Kingsford, President  
Management Institute for National Development

Donald R. Lessard  
Amos Tuck School  
Dartmouth College

Alexander N. McFarlane  
CPC International, Inc.

James R. McSherry  
USM Corporation

Arthur Meehan, Jr.  
New England Merchants Bank

John M. Mugar, President  
Star Market Company

Rutherford Poats, President  
Overseas Private Investment Corporation

Ormsbee Robinson, Director  
University Relations Planning  
IBM Corporation

Richard D. Robinson  
Alfred P. Sloan School of Management  
Massachusetts Institute of Technology

Frances H. Russell  
Fletcher School of Law and Diplomacy

Hon. Leverett Saltonstall

Walter S. Surrey  
Surrey, Karasik, and Morse

Richard Thompson, Director  
Division for Studies  
Institute of International Studies  
Office of Education  
Department of Health, Education and Welfare

W. Homer Turner, Vice President  
Academy for Educational Development

Albert D. Ullman, Provost  
Tufts University

Thomas W. Underhill  
The Kendall Company

Detlev V. Vagts  
Harvard Law School

Gilbert Verbit  
Boston University Law School

Raymond Vernon, Professor  
Harvard Business School

Richard Weintraub  
Boston *Globe*

Thomas Winship  
Boston *Globe*

Gerald Albaum  
College of Business Administration  
University of Oregon

Ralph G. Alden  
Fisher Mills, Inc.

Patricia Baillargeon  
Washington State International Trade Fair

Helmut Becker, Professor  
School of Business and Technology  
Oregon State University

John Brady  
John Fluke Mfg. Company, Inc.

Richard Brinkman, Professor  
School of Business Administration  
Portland State University

Hans A. Brune, Vice President and Director  
International Services  
Weyerhaeuser International, Inc.

J. D. Chalmers, Manager, Corporate Training  
MacMillan Bloedel Limited  
British Columbia

Eugene Clark, Dean  
College of Economics and Business  
Washington State University

Laurence P. Dowd, Professor  
California State University

L. F. Drahotsky, General Director  
Office of Industrial Policy Adviser  
Department of Industry, Trade and Commerce  
Ottawa, Ontario

Edison E. Easton, Professor  
School of Business and Technology  
Oregon State University

Herbert J. Ellison, Director  
Institute of Comparative & Foreign Studies  
University of Washington

E. A. Eschbach  
Battelle-Pacific Northwest Laboratories

Kernit O. Hanson, Dean  
School & Graduate School of Business Admin.  
University of Washington

Eldridge Haynes, Chairman  
Business International Corporations

William Hoekendorf, Dean  
College of Letters and Sciences  
Eastern Washington State College

Gundar J. King, Dean  
School of Business Administration  
Pacific Lutheran University

H. R. Knudson, Professor  
Graduate School of Business Administration  
University of Washington

James Manning, Professor  
School of Business Administration  
Portland State University

Ron Markim, Professor  
College of Economics and Business  
Washington State University

Michael P. Mazur, Professor  
College of Economics and Business  
Washington State University

L. V. Meeker, Vice President  
Business International Corporation

Harold E. Meyer, Manager  
International Administrative Services  
Boeing International Corporation

Howard E. Mitchell, Chairman  
Department of Economics and Business  
Western Washington State College

Richard W. Moxon, Professor  
Graduate School of Business Administration  
University of Washington

Gerhard G. Mueller, Professor  
Graduate School of Business Administration  
University of Washington

Norman C. Olson, Dean  
College of Business Administration  
University of Idaho

Donald D. Parker, Dean  
School of Business Administration  
Portland State University

R. G. Raimondo, Director  
Personnel Services  
MacMillan Bloedel Limited  
British Columbia

Jerry W. Ralston, International Economist  
National Bank of Commerce of Seattle

Ormsbee W. Robinson  
Director of University Relations Planning  
IBM Corporation

Stanley L. Schmuckler, Vice President  
and Director of Personnel  
Seattle-First National Bank

Don L. Short  
Communications for Management

Claude A. Soudah, Vice President  
International Banking Division  
Seattle-First National Bank

Charles E. Summer, Professor  
Graduate School of Business Administration  
University of Washington

Theodore C. Tegeler, Asst. Vice President  
International Department  
The Bank of California

Grant R. Thomas, Dean  
School of Business and Administration  
Eastern Washington State

J. W. C. Tomlinson, Professor  
Faculty of Commerce and Business Admin.  
University of British Columbia

J. Frederick Truitt, Professor  
Graduate School of Business Administration  
University of Washington

W. Homer Turner, Vice President  
Academy for Educational Development

Calvin L. Van Pelt, Director  
International Division  
White Stag

C. William Voris, President  
Thunderbird Graduate School of  
International Management

William C. Wedley, Professor  
Department of Economics and Commerce  
Simon Fraser University

Richard R. West, Dean  
College of Business Administration  
University of Oregon

George H. Weyerhaeuser, President  
Weyerhaeuser Company

Philip H. White, Dean  
Faculty of Commerce and Business Admin.  
University of British Columbia

J. R. W. Wilby, Professor  
School of Business  
Seattle University

W. Winiata, Professor  
Faculty of Commerce and Business Admin.  
University of British Columbia

William H. Winter, Vice President  
and Manager, Europe and Latin America  
First National Bank of Oregon

Judson Wonderly, Director  
Seattle Office of Business Services  
U. S. Department of Commerce

C. G. Alexandrides, Professor  
Southern Consortium for International Education

Jeffrey S. Arpan, Assistant Professor  
Institute of International Business  
Georgia State University

John Bart  
Rollins, Inc.

G. F. Beazley, Professor of Accounting  
University of South Carolina

Herman Berg, Ret. Vice President  
International Sales  
Scripto, Inc.

Joseph Bertotti, Vice President and Director  
General Electric Foundation

Kenneth Black, Dean  
School of Business Administration  
Georgia State University

Richard L. Borer  
Parker and Company

J. D. Butterworth, Chairman  
Marketing Department  
University of Florida

Jose R. de la Torre, Assistant Professor  
Institute of International Business  
Georgia State University

Lorraine Donaldson  
Professor of Economics  
Georgia State University

Merrill E. Douglas, Assistant Professor  
Emory University

Donald Dukes  
AIESEC  
Georgia State University

Edward Flowers  
Georgia State University

W. R. Folks, Associate Professor  
Business Administration  
University of South Carolina

Mildred Glover, Professor of Communications  
Atlanta University

Mark R. Greene, Professor of Insurance  
University of Georgia

William B. Griffin, Vice President  
International Department  
C & S National Bank

W. Rogers Hammond, Dean of Grad. Studies  
School of Business Administration  
Georgia State University

Dunbar Harrison, President  
C & S National Bank of Athens

Robert A. Hawkins, Professor of Economics  
New York University

Harold W. Henry, Associate Professor  
Industrial Management  
University of Tennessee

Juan Hernandez, Associate Professor  
of Management  
Florida International University

Hakaru Itami, Professor  
Insurance and American Management  
Dokkyo University, Tokyo

Jerry R. Jones  
Arthur Andersen and Company

James F. Kane, Dean  
Graduate School of Business  
University of South Carolina

Frank Kaufmann, Asst. Vice President  
Mead Packaging International

R. Eugene Klippel  
Assistant Professor of Marketing  
University of Florida

Duane Kujawa, Assistant Professor  
Institute of International Business  
Georgia State University

M. David Merchant, Project Director  
International and Governmental Affairs  
AACSB

R. W. Molten, Associate Professor  
University of South Carolina

William M. Morgenvolt, Professor  
University of South Carolina

Irvine Morris, International Trade Specialist  
U. S. Department of Commerce

Clark E. Myers, Dean  
School of Business Administration  
Emory University

Roderick R. O'Connor  
Professor of Management  
Georgia State University

E. W. Ogram, Director  
Institute of International Business  
Georgia State University

Donald Patillo  
Georgia State University

Daniel Paul, Assistant Director  
U. S. Department of Commerce

Eduardo Perez  
AIESEC  
Georgia State University

Glenn Robinson, President  
Scientific Atlanta, Inc.

Ormsbee W. Robinson, Director  
University Relations Planning  
IBM Corporation

H. Lee Roper, Group Vice President  
E. T. Barwick Industries, Inc.

John B. Ross, Dean  
College of Business Administration  
University of Tennessee

Richard R. Still, Coordinator  
International Business Program  
University of Georgia

Edward C. Strong  
Assistant Professor of Marketing  
Tulane University

Robert L. Thornton, Coordinator  
Multinational Business Program  
Florida State University

Brian Toyne  
Georgia State University

Robert S. Tritt  
University of Georgia

Benjamin Trooboff  
Professor of Business Administration  
Atlanta University

W. Homer Turner, Vice President  
Academy for Educational Development

Robert A. Ullrich  
Associate Dean for Academic Affairs  
Vanderbilt University

Rafael Valiente  
Assistant Professor Marketing  
Georgia State University

Robert C. Vowels, Dean  
School of Business Administration  
Atlanta University

Oliver Welch, Professor of Management  
Atlanta University

Jack Welsh, Director  
International Division  
Department of Industry & Trade

Irwin B. Wiener, President  
Pelham Manufacturing Company

Harding Young, Professor of Management  
Georgia State University

Preston Zoller  
AIESEC  
Emory University